

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION N | O. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|---------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 10/083,366 | | 02/27/2002 | Tsung-Hsiung Wang | WANG3118/EM | 5874 |
| 23364 | 7590 | 07/29/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| | & THOM TERS LAN | IAS, PLLC E | PADGETT, MARIANNE L | | |
| FOURTH | | _ | | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBE | |
| ALEXAN | IDRIA, VA | A 22314 | | 1762 | |
| | | | | DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | () | |
|---|---|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Office Action Cumment | 10/082,360 | Wong | etal | |
| Office Action Summary | 10/08 3,366 Examiner M. L. Pal | 1 H | iroup Art Unit | |
| | Milital | get/ | 1162 | |
| -The MAILING DATE of this communication appears | on the cover sheet be | neath the corre | spondence ad | dress— |
| Period for Reply | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO OF THIS COMMUNICATION. | EXPIRE | MONTH(S) F | ROM THE MAI | LING DATE |
| Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a report of NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuent or adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ly within the statutory mini expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro te, cause the application to | mum of thirty (30) o m the mailing date o become ABANDO | lays will be consid of this communica DNED (35 U.S.C. § | lered timely. ation. 133). |
| Status | | | | |
| Status Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/4/0 4 | | | • | · · |
| 71 This action is FINAL . | | | | |
| Since this application is in condition for allowance except f accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935. | | | he merits is cl | osed in |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | |
| ☑ Claim(s) 25 - 39 | | is/are pen | ding in the appl | ication. |
| Of the above claim(s) | | is/are with | drawn from cor | sideration. |
| □ Claim(s) | | | | J. |
| □ Claim(s) 25-39 | | is/are rejec | cted. | |
| □ Claim(s) | <u> </u> | is/are obje | cted to. | |
| □ Claim(s) | | | | or election |
| Application Papers | | requireme | nt | |
| ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on | · | ☐ disapproved. | | |
| ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected | ed to by the Examiner | | | |
| ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | |
| ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) | | | | |
| $\hfill \square$ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority ur | der 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a) | –(d). | | |
| ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the: | | | | |
| ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been re- | | | | |
| ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been re- | ceived in Application N | o | •. | |
| ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents | | | | |
| in this national stage application from the International | | | | |
| *Certified copies not received: | | | | _· |
| Attachment(s) | | | | |
| ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(| s) 🗆 Ir | nterview Summa | ry, PTO-413 | |
| □ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 | | lotice of Informal | Patent Applica | tion, PTO-152 |
| ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 | | ther | | |
| Office Ac | tion Summary | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 11/00) Part of Paper No. <u>80040528</u>

Art Unit: 1762

1. Claims 25-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims' language is much improved, however considering the clearer phrasing causes a few questions on intended meaning. In claim 25, step (b), "field functional control" has no inherent or standard scientific meaning. In the former, "field" of what is not defined, nor does "functional" supply any necessary meaning, but everything can be said to have some kind of function. No formed definition of this phrase coined by applicant was found in the specification, and it is noted that new claim 29 that appears to sort of correspond to old claim 15, might be providing scope for this term, but has its own logic/grammar problems. In claim 29, line 2, "the homogeneous coating" is a noun or product, not an action, and would appear to correspond to "a conductive polymer film" of step (b) if taken literally. Would intended meaning for claim 29 correspond to --wherein the field in the field functional control of step (b) is selected from the group consisting of a microwave field, an electrical field, a magnetic field, a fluid force field or combinations thereof--?

In step (c) of claim 25, what "combination" means in the phrase "electromagnetic combination field" is not apparent, as it has no standard meaning in the art. What electromagnetic fields are being combined? Is this term intended in some way to be the combination of the two previously mentioned fields of step (c), "molecules structure ordered field control" and "self-stacking field control"? If so, it is not clear from the claim language, since neither of these two first mentioned fields have anything necessarily to do with electromagnetism. However, given the overall context, for examination purposes it will be considered the two claimed "field controls" are effects of an applied electromagnetic field, and lacking any further clear definition, any electromagnetic field may be employed, as long as it causes control of these properties, as well as the following "to maintain and to strengthen..." limitation. For 25

Art Unit: 1762

(c), it is noted that claim 31 may shed some light on possible intentions of "combination". Clarity in the claims on these issues is desirable.

In claim 30, while not detrimental to understanding the meaning of the limitation in line 3, "is a containing electrical field..." is not idiomatic English nor correct grammar, so applicants might consider revising the phrasing. It is also noted, that as now phrased none of "a coating tool and coating control system" or "a coating thickness" have any necessary connection to the steps or coating of the independent claim.

- Applicant's amendments have adequately clarified the independent claim to necessitate that the substrate is microwave treated before deposition of the conductor polymer, as well as to more clearly necessitate effects that result from the coating technique, such at that Burroughes et al (6,558,219) is no longer an appropriate reference, lacking the claimed microwave <u>pre</u>-treatment, and the consequent effects: As pointed out by applicants on page 8 of their February 4, 2004 response, the examples of 2-5 which compare with and without microwave plasma treatment, demonstrate the importance of this step.
- 3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In reviewing the cited examples (pages 9-11), the examiner notes the presence of an unknown/unfamiliar unit abbreviation "i m" (i with an accent, space, m). Given the context, something to do with thickness might be intended, but is not clear to the examiner, and clarification (supported definition and/or supported amendment) is needed.

Also, some amendments of form might be considered, such as use of standard labeling of examples (comparative example for only prior art or examples not using the critical invention features). Presently, all deposition examples are labeled "compared example", both with and without plasma pretreatment, which may be misleading to the reader. Some revising for more idiomatic English, such as at the start of examples 2-5, might also improve readability of the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 1762

ļ

4. Applicant's arguments filed 2/4/04 and discusses above have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 25-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marianne L. Padgett whose telephone number is (571) 272-1425. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from about 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive Beck can be reached on (571) 272-1415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1762

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M.L. Padgett/dh June 30, 2004

July 27, 2004

MARIANNE PADGETT PRIMARY EXAMINER